1 November 1984

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
SECURITY COMMITTEE

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION WORKING GROUP

MEMORANDUM FOR: Phillip Eckman, Chairman, R&D Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Proposed Destruction Standard for Classified Documents

1. Reference:

a. Interim Federal Specification FF-P-00800A Amendment 2, dated June 15, 1972, Pulping Machines - Classified Waste Paper.

b. Interim Federal Specification FF-P-00810A Amendment 3, dated June 15, 1972 - Pulverizing Machines - Paper Classified Waste.

c. Interim Federal Specification FF-S-001169 w/Amendment 3 dated 5 July 1971 - Shredders - Classified Waste.

d. National Security Agency (NSA) NACSCOM 4010.

e. Memorandum OSD dated 26 September 1977 w/letter Department of the Navy Sev 009D332/168176 dated 27 May 1977, copy attached.

2. Reference e surfaced a question that to this day has not been fully addressed nor resolved. Specifically, why can a shredder produce a particle whose physical area is "X" square inches or square millimeters, but the particle size from a pulverizer (see reference b para 3.2) must be smaller than "X". Samples showing this size disparity are attached.

3. The significance of this size disparity becomes apparent in paragraph 3 of reference e where a 1/32-inch increase in screen size for the Navy's SEM Chopper Type Pulverizer produced a 50 percent increase in production capacity without a significant reduction in security. This latter contention is based on a size comparison of this residuce with the "X" area of approved shredder residue, samples attached.

1 November 1984

SUBJECT: Proposed Destruction Standard for Classified Documents

4. The secure particle size disparity problem is further exacerbated when we examine the residue generated by the other popular type pulverizer, called the hammermill. Both pulverizers obtain their design guidance from reference b. Hammermills discharge paper fiber because para 3.2 of that specification (written 1965 and amended in 1971) stipulates residue "shall consist of 85 percent fibrous bulk with no single piece of paper larger than 5mm in any dimension". The other option in para 3.2 is even more stringent, since nothing larger than 3/32-inch (2.38mm) can exit the security screen. Both options, when applied to hammermills destroying paper base documents, result in gross over-kill, i.e., fibrous dust and a high potential for explosion, plus excessive cost of operation and shortened equipment life.

5. It is proposed reference b be amended relative to the particulate size for pulverizer types, i.e., choppers, hammermills, and the various hybrids. The standard proposed is simply that no paper particulate exiting the destruction device shall have an area larger than that allowed for shred particulate of security shredders roughly 15.6mm^2 or 0.0242 square inches or if larger, they shall be devoid of print or type on both surfaces in 90 percent of the particulate (for hammermill type pulverizers). In the latter instance, maximum particulate dimension cannot exceed 3/8-inch (.375-inch or 9.5mm).

6. No recommended changes are envisioned at this time for reference a, wet pulping equipment.

7. Reference c, the shredder specification, needs a third class of shredder to cover the 3/32-inch x 1/2-inch machines now approved to destroy classified computer printouts, ADP cards, etc., SECRET and below.

8. If concurrence for these changes is obtained from the R&D Subcommittee, we can forward thru the SECOM, a letter to the proponent of these specifications, General Services Administration (GSA), requesting that action be taken.

9. Your guidance and assistance is requested.

4 Achmts

PAUL W. VON STEIN
Chairman
Document Destruction Working Group